BYLAWS GOVERNING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY

COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING DEPT.

EFFECTIVE DATE: MARCH 12, 2009 INCLUDES AMENDMENTS THROUGH MAY 2023

BYLAWS GOVERNING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES USED FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY

COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING DEPT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. Overall Evaluation Principles

Faculty will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The department faculty are viewed as a diverse set of creative individuals who may excel in different areas. It is not possible to completely specify all possible appropriate and meritorious activities, accomplishments, awards, etc that a faculty member may engage in. Therefore, an exhaustive list of criteria with associated quantitative weights is not given here. The list given here merely serves as guidance by giving examples of valued criteria. I.e., as part of their evaluation packet, a faculty member may formally make a case for engaging in and being evaluated on any creative activity, even if it is not listed here. Viceversa, the criteria listed here are not all compulsory. I.e., a faculty member may choose to not list activities or achievements under some of the criteria listed here. However, the core activities of faculty: publishing in high quality outlets, participation in and organization of national and international research and educational forums, service to the university and the profession, garnering funding for research and educational activities, and quality teaching and pedagogical activities are clearly the main foci of faculty evaluations. Any documented effort at these activities will be taken into consideration.

The evaluation criteria and procedures discussed in this document are for: annual performance, tenure and promotion, merit pay raise and finally market equity raise. There are redundancies in the criteria and procedures and the structure of this document reflects that. All annual performance evaluation criteria are relevant in the consideration of merit pay and tenure and promotion so the former are described first. However, receiving a given rating in an annual evaluation at the departmental level does not necessarily imply that one will receive the same rating in that area for merit or promotion and tenure.

Article 1. Annual Performance Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty

Performance evaluations by the chair of the unit are intended to communicate to a faculty member a qualitative assessment of that faculty member's performance of assigned duties by providing written constructive feedback that will assist in improving the faculty member's performance and expertise. Faculty shall be evaluated according to the approved standards and procedures that were in place prior to the beginning of the evaluation period. The faculty member's annual evaluation shall also consider, where appropriate and available, information from the following sources: immediate supervisor, peers, students, faculty member/self, other university officials who have responsibility for supervision of the faculty member, and individuals to whom the faculty member may be responsible in the course of a service assignment. Any materials to be used in the evaluation process submitted by persons other than the faculty member shall be shown to the faculty member, who may attach a written response.

1.1 University Level Criteria and Procedures

The annual performance evaluations shall be based upon assigned duties, and shall carefully consider the nature of the assignments and quality of the performance in terms, where applicable, of:
   a. Teaching effectiveness, including effectiveness in presenting knowledge, information, and ideas by means or methods such as lecture, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration, laboratory exercise, practical experience, student evaluations, assessment of and engagement with student work, and direct consultation with students.
      1) The evaluation shall include consideration of effectiveness in presenting knowledge and skills, and effectiveness in stimulating students' critical thinking and/or creative abilities, the development or revision of curriculum or course

structure or pedagogical methods, and adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students.

2) The evaluation shall include consideration of other assigned university teaching duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, or duties of the position held by the faculty member.

3) The evaluator shall take into account any relevant materials submitted by the faculty member such as class notes, syllabi, student exams and assignments, a faculty member's teaching portfolio, results of peer evaluations of teaching, and any other materials relevant to the faculty member's instructional assignment.

4) The chair shall consider all information available in forming an assessment of teaching effectiveness.

b. Contribution to the discovery of new knowledge, development of new educational techniques, and other forms of research/scholarship/creative activity.

1) Evidence of research/scholarship/creative activity, either print or electronic, shall include, but not be limited to, published books, chapters in books; articles and papers in professional journals; musical compositions, paintings, sculpture; works of performing art; papers presented at meetings of professional societies; reviews, and research and creative activity that has not yet resulted in publication, display or performance.

2) The evaluation shall include consideration of the quality and quantity of the faculty member's research/scholarship and other creative programs and contributions during the evaluation period, and recognition by the academic or professional community of what has been accomplished.

c. Service within the university and public service that extends professional or discipline-related contributions to the community; the State, including public schools; and the national and international community. Such service includes contributions to scholarly and professional conferences and organizations and unpaid positions on governmental boards, agencies, and commissions that are beneficial to such groups and individuals.

d. Participation in the governance processes of the institution through significant service on committees, councils, and senates, and the faculty member's contributions to the governance of the institution through participation in regular departmental or college meetings.

e. Service as the UFF/UF President, service on the UFF bargaining team, or service as an official UFF grievance representative shall be considered significant service for the purposes of this subsection.

f. Other assigned university duties, such as advising, counseling, supervision of interns, and academic administration, or as described in a Position Description, if any, of the position held by the faculty member.

1.2 Departmental clarification of university level criteria and procedures

Faculty in the Dept. of CISE shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in Article 1.2 and rated as either Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in Teaching, Research and Service based on their performance in each of those areas. If there is any conflict between the College and Departmental level criteria, the departmental criteria in Article 1.2 shall be used. Faculty member's overall rating of Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be based upon consideration of their assignment and their rating in each of the three primary categories. Therefore, the percentage assignment to each area should be known by each faculty member at the beginning of the evaluation period. There may be adjustments to assignments during the evaluation period based on unforeseen changes. For example, a opportunity to participate on a large multi-investigator grant could present itself to a faculty member who thereby ends up with much more research activity than was planned for. In such an example, the research percentage for that faculty member may be increased.

The evaluation period for a faculty member's performance will be the previous year. The performance evaluation will depend on standardized activity reports submitted by the faculty member to the Chair of the CISE dept. Evaluations may be reviewed by the CISE steering committee but if any evaluations reviewed by the committee, then all evaluations must be reviewed by the committee to provide the appropriate context.

Examples of Satisfactory Performance in each of the three primary categories are given below. These are not intended to be exhaustive, they are merely examples. Moreover, since evaluations will take assignment into consideration, what is considered excellent for one faculty member may not be for another. For example, if the primary assignment of a faculty member is in teaching then Excellence in teaching requires examples such as those listed under Excellent below. However, if the primary assignment of a faculty member is research, then an Excellent rating in teaching may be given using criteria under the Satisfactory listing below. Thus, the evaluation is conditioned on the assignment.

Teaching:

Excellent

In addition to meeting the criteria for Satisfactory performance, the following additional criteria shall be considered in the assignment of an Excellent rating.

1. Obtaining funding for teaching infrastructure such as new teaching laboratories, equipment, or software; or funding for teaching assistants, fellowships, and scholarships.
2. Publishing in educational journals.
3. Development of meaningful new courses.
4. Publishing textbooks that are in use at a significant number of institutions.

However, if a faculty member is teaching three or more courses, then less weight will be given to the above criteria and more emphasis will be put on things such as excellent teaching evaluations, exit interviews, and peer evaluations as well as significant excellence in teaching awards.

Satisfactory

1. Evaluations
    a. Student evaluations near or above departmental averages and/or
    b. Other positive feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews and/or
    c. Awards for excellence in teaching and/or
    d. Satisfactory peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by dept. chair
2. Level of Effort
    a. Course content kept up to date
    b. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives in existing courses or development of new courses
    c. Timely fulfillment of ABET assessment requirements

Unsatisfactory

1. Evaluations
      a. Student evaluations well below departmental averages and/or
      b. Other negative feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews
2. Level of Effort
      a. Course content not kept up to date
      b. Lack of introduction of new approaches and new initiatives in existing courses and no development of new courses
      c. Late or incomplete reporting of assigned ABET assessments

Research:

Excellent

1. Publications in high quality, peer reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings at a high rate for the discipline.
2. High level of participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students.
3. Research funding at a high level for the specific discipline, to fund the support of many graduate students and a vibrant research program which may also include salary buy-out.
4. Supervision and graduation of a high number of Ph.D. students for the specific discipline, with strong dissertations that produce scholarly publications in reputable journals and conferences.

Satisfactory

1. Publications in high quality, peer reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings at a rate in keeping with the specific discipline.
2. Participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Research funding at a level appropriate to the specific discipline and sufficiently adequate to fund a vibrant research program including support of graduate students
4. Supervision and graduation of an adequate number of Ph.D. students appropriate to the specific discipline, with strong dissertations that produce scholarly publications in reputable journals and conferences

Unsatisfactory

1. Publications in poor quality journals or conference proceedings or in high quality venues but at a rate well below departmental averages
2. Little or no participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Little or no research funding or poor proposal generation rate
4. Supervision of fewer Ph.D students than appropriate for the specific discipline or no Ph.D. students

Service:

Excellent

Editor-in-Chief of highly reputable journal

General or program chair of highly reputable conference
Special session organizer for highly reputable conference
Significant advisory activities for government agencies
University-level leadership in shared governance

Satisfactory
Service to profession through participation as
       member or chair of professional or technical committee
       program committee member
       Associate Editor of Archival Journal
Service to department, college or university through participation in
       faculty meetings and departmental, college or university committees

Unsatisfactory

No service to the profession
Poor performance of duties as member of department, college or university committees

1.3 Procedure for Peer Input related to Sustained Performance Evaluation (SPE)

The purpose of this section of the departmental bylaws is to add the required clarifications specifically to Article 18.8 (a) and (b) of the 2021-24 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), or directly equivalent and substantively unchanged clauses of future collective bargaining agreements.

An important guiding principle is that the implementation of SPE remain consistent with widely accepted academic freedom and tenure provisions including those in the CBA.
Faculty should be able to express their full creative potential by actively exercising academic freedom in their research, teaching, service or other assigned duties without being forced by currently popular trends. In addition, impacts bargained in any applicable memoranda of understanding and the faculty member's specific circumstances should be considered. Finally, any formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) should be reasonable and equitable, especially if the faculty member has chosen to change direction within their research, teaching, service or other assigned duties.

Timeline. The process described below shall take place at the beginning of the Fall semester immediately following the period specified in the CBA and applies *only* to faculty members who do *not* automatically receive a satisfactory SPE based on previous annual evaluations, pursuant to the CBA's provisions.
Process.
        a. Eligible members of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion (T&P) committee shall review and discuss the faculty member's evaluation file (as defined in the CBA). The review and discussion shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the principles of academic freedom and tenure, taking into consideration the faculty member's specific circumstances. After the discussion, the committee will provide advisory feedback on the faculty member's overall SPE and PIP to the department chair. The advisory feedback shall be included in the faculty member's evaluation file. The faculty member may attach a concise response to the evaluation.

Article 2. Tenure and Promotion For Tenure Track Faculty

The Dept. of Computer and Information Science and Engineering criteria statement is as follows:
As a major unit of the College of Engineering of the University of Florida, the Dept. of Computer and Information Science and Engineering pursues the same mission as the university and the college, and promotes excellence in teaching, research, and service. It therefore abides by the University and College rules and procedures for tenure and promotion. Additional clarifications specific to the department are given below.

2.1 Departmental Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

Evaluation of faculty for promotion, tenure and salary adjustment via the salary pay plan focuses on performance in teaching, research, and service. Performance evaluations are useful in the evaluation although separate packets will be required for consideration for promotion and tenure.

a) To be recommended for promotion to Assoc. Professor or for tenure, a faculty member is expected to have an Excellent ranking in two of these areas. Since the principal responsibilities of each department are teaching and research, performance in these areas is emphasized unless the candidate's service contributions are extraordinary in significance, impact and visibility. Service to the public school sector is considered to be important and will be considered in the evaluation process. Evidence of teaching effectiveness, success in securing funded research, publications in scholarly journals, honors and awards, national recognition, Ph.D. production, and potential for long term success will be taken into consideration. Further examples of information to be considered for evaluation are given in Article 1.2.

b) For promotion to Professor, the candidate must have established a distinguished record in his/her field with evidence of national and international recognition. He/she must have excelled in teaching and research, conditioned on his/her assignments, and have an impressive record of service to the profession at both national and international levels. The quality as well as the quantity of technical contributions will be judged. Further examples of information to be considered for evaluation are given in Article 2.2.

2.2 Metrics To Be Used for Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty

Annual evaluations shall be taken into consideration in the time period that starts at the latest date from the following set of dates: the date of the last promotion of the faculty member, the faculty member's first date of employment, 6 years prior to the date of the request for promotion and/or tenure. However, an independent document describing the faculty member's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure must be produced using guidelines defined by the CISE Department and College of Engineering The following are examples of activities and accomplishments that will be considered for evaluation of faculty:

Research:
1. Publications
      a. Peer reviewed
            i. Journal papers
                  1. Journal quality
                  2. Journal impact factor
            ii. Papers in conference proceedings and other refereed volumes
                  1. Acceptance rate
                  2. Quality
                  3. Number of reviewers per paper
      b. Not peer reviewed
            i. Advanced level books, texts, and monographs

   ii. Patents and copyrights
   iii. Conference papers
   iv. Other scholarly works
2. Originality and relevance of research
  a. Citation indices generated by ISI without self-citations
  b. External letters
  c. Evidence of research work being actively used by other institutions and industry
3. Recognition and stature in profession
  a. Awards, Fellowships, etc.
  b. Invited talks, Keynote talks
  c. Other honors
4. Research funding
5. Graduate student supervision
  a. Number and quality of Ph.D supervised/graduated
  b. Number and quality of Engineer supervised/graduated
  c. Number and quality of M.S. supervised/graduated
  d. Student placement

Teaching:

1. Evaluations
  a. Student
  b. Peer
  c. Awards
2. Level of Effort
  a. Class size
  b. Updating of course content
  c. Laboratory/facilities development
  d. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives
3. Innovation
  a. New course development
  b. Undergraduate and beginning graduate textbook publication
  c. Other teaching related materials, tools or content
4. Funding
  a. Teaching related grants
   i. Source and type
   ii. Type of review
5. Publications
  a.   Teaching   related   publications

Service:

1. Teaching
  i. Professional education
  ii. Educational research
  iii. Non-traditional teaching
2. Publications
  i. Journals
  ii. Conference Proceedings
  iii. Manuals
  iv. Codes
  iii. Non-traditional media
  iv. Government or non-profit institute reports
3. External service recognition, commendations, awards
4. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact.

5. Professional Service
     i. Advisor to student society
     ii. Member, Chair, or Officer of professional committees or societies
     iii. Other service activities
6. Coordination of teaching or research programs
7. Government advisory boards

2.3   *Mentoring During Tenure Probationary Period*

The department will establish a mentoring program for faculty during their tenure probationary period. The program will include consultation assessing the faculty member's progress toward tenure. No mentors will be required to provide written assessments. The criteria and metrics described in previous sections will be used to advise faculty with regards to their performance.

2.4   *Mid-tenure Review*

During March or April of the third year of the probationary period, faculty will participate in a special midterm review. The purpose of this review shall be to assess the faculty member's progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure and to provide thoughtful and constructive guidance to assist the faculty member in fulfilling the tenure criteria. Faculty undergoing this review must prepare a packet using the current tenure template, but without the external letters of evaluation. Tenured faculty members of the department shall review the packet and meet with the department chair to assess whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, according to the criteria described in previous sections, and at a rate appropriate for a faculty member in their third year. In particular, it is important that the faculty mentor participate in this review. The appraisal process shall be confidential. Results of the evaluation shall not be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file, shall not be included in the subsequent tenure packet and shall not be used in any way in any future evaluation of the faculty member for tenure.

Article 3. Merit Raise Criteria For Tenure Track Faculty

3.1 Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

Pay raises based on merit may be used to promote and further various goals of the Dept. of Computer and Information Science and Engineering including:

1. Advance departmental mission
2. Improve the quality of department programs
3. Recognize and reward meritorious performance and sustained excellence of faculty
4. Promote retention of the most valuable and productive faculty
5. Improve faculty morale
6. Provide incentives for future faculty efforts
7. Improve department reputation in national surveys

3.2 Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises

Merit-based pay raises should be based on the quality and quantity of faculty activities in the areas of research, teaching, and/or service. Merit-based raises should generally reflect a continuous trend of productivity and excellence over a period of several years, as opposed to being based on achievements during a single academic year. Merit evaluations should be based on the standardized activity reports submitted by the faculty member over the evaluation period for their annual evaluations, which will serve as the faculty member's 'case for merit'. In addition, merit deliberations may also consider other formal documents prepared during the evaluation period such as: promotion folders including external letters, and recent memoranda of understanding written by the chair following an extended discussion with the faculty member.

3.3 Procedure for Award of Merit Pay Raises

A specific procedure for awarding merit pay raises that is consistent with these general guidelines will be voted on by the tenure track faculty and maintained on the departmental website. The process may be modified if a proposal to do so is presented to the entire tenure track faculty, a discussion and subsequent vote take place, and a majority of the faculty voting vote to form a committee to modify the process. The resulting modification will then presented to, discussed by, and voted on by the tenure track faculty. For examples of procedures, see the College of Engineering REPORT OF THE AD-HOC MERIT PAY COMMITTEE June 11, 2004. The process in place at the time this document was produced is given below.

```
CISE Department Merit Pay Process (Apr 27, 2007, version)
This version was approved by a secret faculty vote conducted May 4 through May 11. 17
in favor, 9 against, and 3 abstain.

(1) Near the end of each Spring semester, each faculty member prepares an activity
report, and submits it to the CISE Chair.

(2) As part of his or her evaluation, the Chair also makes a preliminary placement of
the faculty member into one of typically five "bins", based on the contents of the
activity report.  This placement is made according to the Merit Pay Criteria already
established by the department.  Because merit pay increases are not available every
year, the placement may consider up to 3 past years of performance.
```

(3) The Chair communicates these bin placements to each faculty member (each faculty member receiving only his or her own bin placement). Along with this placement, the Chair writes an overall summary of the placement process for the whole department, describing the typical performance levels of the faculty members in each bin, and how many faculty were placed in each bin.   The summary includes a qualitative and quantitative summary of the performance levels of faculty in each bin. This overall summary is given to each faculty member.

(4) If a faculty member feels that his or her placement in a bin does not reflect their performance, then he or she requests a meeting with the Chair in order to reconcile it.   This request, and the meeting, must take place within one week after step (3) completes, with reasonable allowances made in case of travel.

(5) If the meeting does not lead to a result acceptable to the faculty member, the faculty member requests the CISE Steering Committee to review the result. The request is made in writing, giving the reasons why an appeal is being made. This request for a review must be made within one week after the meeting in step (4). If the faculty member is also a member of the Steering Committee, then he or she does not take part in the Steering Committee's review of his or her case.

(6) The CISE Steering Committee reviews all appealed merit placements, at the same time. In order to make an accurate recommendation, the committee may ask the Chair to clarify his or her overall summary (see (3) above). The committee may also ask the Chair for a briefing. The Steering Committee meets with the faculty member, and makes a recommendation to the Chair for each appealed result, within two weeks after step (5) completes (that is, no later than four weeks after the initial evaluation by the Chair).

(7) The Chair makes any adjustments to the merit pay bin placement, based on the Steering Committee's recommendation. If the CISE Steering Committee's recommendation differs from the Chair's final placement, the Chair provides a written explanation of the discrepancy to the Committee, and to the faculty member.

(8) The Chair submits his or her recommendation for merit pay salary increases to the Dean, according to the merit bin placement of each faculty member. Modest differences of merit pay increases may exist within each bin, but the salary increase of faculty placed in a higher bin will not be less than the salary increase of faculty placed in a lower bin.

Footnote: The CISE Steering Committee consists of at least four faculty members. This document does not specify how the CISE Steering Committee is selected; as of Spring 2007, its members are appointed by the Chair.

Article 4 Annual Performance Evaluation For Non Tenure Track Faculty

Performance evaluations by the chair of the unit are intended to communicate to a faculty member a qualitative assessment of that faculty member's performance of assigned duties by providing written constructive feedback that will assist in improving the faculty member's performance and expertise. Faculty shall be evaluated according to the approved standards and procedures that were in place prior to the beginning of the evaluation period. The faculty member's annual evaluation shall also consider, where appropriate and available, information from the following sources: immediate supervisor, peers, students, faculty member/self, other university officials who have responsibility for supervision of the faculty member, and individuals to whom the faculty member may be responsible in the course of a service assignment. Any materials to be used in the evaluation process submitted by persons other than the faculty member shall be shown to the faculty member, who may attach a written response.

4.1 University Level Criteria and Procedures

The University Level Criteria and Procedures are the same as for the tenure track faculty.

4.2 Departmental clarification of university level criteria and procedures

Faculty in the Dept. of CISE shall be evaluated annually according to the criteria listed in Article 4.2 and rated as either Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in Teaching, Research and Service based on their performance in each of those areas. If there is any conflict between the College and Departmental level criteria, the departmental criteria in Article 4.2 shall be used. Faculty member's overall rating of Excellent, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be based upon consideration of their assignment and their rating in each of the three primary categories. Therefore, the percentage assignment to each area should be known by each faculty member at the beginning of the evaluation period. There may be adjustments to assignments during the evaluation period based on unforeseen changes. For example, a opportunity to participate on a large multi-investigator grant could present itself to a faculty member who thereby ends up with much more research activity than was planned for. In such an example, the research percentage for that faculty member may be increased.

The evaluation period for a faculty member's performance will be the previous year. The performance evaluation will depend on standardized activity reports submitted by the faculty member to the Chair of the CISE dept. Evaluations may be reviewed by the CISE steering committee but if any evaluations reviewed by the committee, then all evaluations must be reviewed by the committee to provide the appropriate context.

Examples of Satisfactory Performance in each of the three primary categories are given below. These are not intended to be exhaustive, they are merely examples. Moreover, since evaluations will take assignment into consideration, what is considered excellent for one faculty member may not be for another. For example, if the primary assignment of a faculty member is in teaching then Excellence in teaching requires examples such as those listed under Excellent below. However, if the primary assignment of a faculty member is research, then an Excellent rating in teaching may be given using criteria under the Satisfactory listing below. Thus, the evaluation is conditioned on the assignment.

Teaching:

Excellent

1. Evaluations
   a. Student evaluations significantly above departmental averages and/or
   b. Other positive feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews and/or
   c. Awards for excellence in teaching and/or
   d. Excellent peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by dept. chair

2. Level of Effort
   a. Course content kept up to date
   b. Introduction of significant new approaches and new initiatives in existing courses or development of meaningful new courses
   c. Number of senior and other student projects advised well above the departmental average
   d. Timely fulfillment of ABET assessment requirements

3. Obtaining funding for teaching infrastructure such as new teaching laboratories, equipment, or software; or funding for teaching assistants, fellowships, and scholarships.

4. Publishing in educational journals.

5. Publishing textbooks that are in use at a significant number of institutions.

Satisfactory

1. Evaluations
   a. Student evaluations near or above departmental averages and/or
   b. Other positive feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews and/or
   c. Satisfactory peer evaluation from observation and analysis arranged by dept. chair

2. Level of Effort
   a. Course content kept up to date
   b. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives in existing courses or development of new courses
   c. Advising near the departmental average of senior and other student projects
   d. Timely fulfillment of ABET assessment requirements
   e. Level of administrative overhead as reflected by class size and degree of TA support

Unsatisfactory

1. Evaluations
   a. Student evaluations well below departmental averages and/or
   b. Other negative feedback from students, e.g. during exit interviews

2. Level of Effort
   a. Course content not kept up to date
   b. Lack of introduction of new approaches and new initiatives in existing courses and no development of new courses
   c. Number of senior and other student projects advised well below the departmental average
   d. Late or incomplete reporting of assigned ABET assessments

Research:

Excellent

1. Publications in high quality, peer reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings at a high rate for the discipline.
2. High level of participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students.
3. Research funding at a high level for the specific discipline, to fund the support of many graduate students and a vibrant research program which may also include salary buy-out.
4. Supervision and graduation of a high number of Ph.D. students for the specific discipline, with strong dissertations that produce scholarly publications in reputable journals and conferences.

Satisfactory

1. Publications in high quality, peer reviewed journals or prestigious conference proceedings at a rate in keeping with the specific discipline.
2. Participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Research funding at a level appropriate to the specific discipline and sufficiently adequate to fund a vibrant research program including support of graduate students
4. Supervision and graduation of an adequate number of Ph.D. students appropriate to the specific discipline, with strong dissertations that produce scholarly publications in reputable journals and conferences

Unsatisfactory

1. Publications in poor quality journals or conference proceedings or in high quality venues but at a rate well below departmental averages
2. Little or no participation in conferences through contributed or invited presentations by faculty and/or their students
3. Little or no research funding or poor proposal generation rate
4. Supervision of fewer Ph.D students than appropriate for the specific discipline or no Ph.D. students

Service:

Excellent

Editor-in-Chief of highly reputable journal
General or program chair of highly reputable conference
Special session organizer for highly reputable conference
Significant advisory activities for government agencies
University-level leadership in shared governance

Satisfactory
Service to profession through participation as
     member or chair of professional or technical committee
     program committee member
     Associate Editor of Archival Journal
Service to department, college or university through participation in

faculty meetings and departmental, college or university committees
or advising student organizations

Unsatisfactory

No service to the profession
Poor performance of duties as member of department, college or university committees

Article 5 Promotion Criteria For Non Tenure Track Faculty

5.1 Engineer Series

Evaluation of faculty members in the Engineer Series for promotion is focused primarily on performance in service. Performance in either teaching or research may also be considered depending upon the faculty member's assignment. Engineer Series faculty are expected to excel in their assigned areas. The quality of performance must be consistent with that of the Professional Series for the equivalent rank taking the more applied nature of the research into account. In this track, research is usually considered to be very applied and related to professional activities. Areas like professional education, educational research, applied research, and non-traditional teaching (short courses, professional development, etc.) are also to be considered. The percentage assignment of their duties must be taken into consideration. Further description of metrics that can be considered for evaluation is given in Article 5.4.

5.2. Research Scientist Series

Evaluation of faculty members in the Research Scientist Series for promotion is generally limited to performance in research. If service or teaching activities are part of the faculty member's assignment, they must also be included in the evaluation. Performance in research is the driver for promotion and salary decisions, however, and faculty are expected to excel in research. The quality of their research performance must be consistent with that of the Professorial Series for the equivalent rank. Further description of metrics that can be considered for evaluation is given in Article 5.4.

5.3. Lecturer Series

Evaluation for promotion in the Lecturer series is primarily for faculty involved in teaching, thus promotion in the lecturer track requires demonstrating excellence in teaching. Performance in service or research may also be considered depending on the faculty assignment. Teaching is evaluated in three areas: teaching quality, innovation in approaches to enhance student learning and professional development. Service is evaluated on quality and benefit to the goals of the department, college and university. Further description of metrics that can be considered for evaluation is given in Article 5.4.

Article 5.4 Metrics To Be Used for Evaluation of Non Tenure Track Faculty

Research:
1. Publications
    a. Peer reviewed

        i. Journal Papers
           1. Journal Quality
           2. Journal impact factor
        ii. Papers in conference proceedings and other refereed volumes
           1. Acceptance rate
           2. Quality
           3. Number of reviewers per paper
    b. Not peer reviewed
        i. Advanced level books, texts, and monographs
        ii. Patents and copyrights
        iii. Conference papers
        iv. Other scholarly works

2. Originality and relevance of research
    a. Citation indices without self-citations
    b. External letters
    c. Evidence of research work being actively used by other institutions and industry
3. Recognitions and stature in profession
    a. Awards, Fellowships, etc.
    b. Invited talks, Keynote talks
    c. Other honors
4. Research funding
5. Graduate student supervision (if eligible for graduate faculty)
    a. Number and quality of Ph.D. supervised/graduated
    b. Number and quality of Engineer supervised/graduated
    c. Number and quality of M.S. supervised/graduated
    d. Student placement

Teaching:
1. Evaluations
    a. Student
    b. Peer
    c. Awards
2. Level of Effort
    a. Class size
    b. Number of sections
    c. Updating of course content
    d. Laboratory/facilities development
    e. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives
    f. Diversity of teaching assignment (distinct types of courses)
3. Innovations
    a. New course development
    b. Undergraduate and beginning graduate textbook publication
    c. Other teaching related publications
4. Funding
    a. Teaching related grants
        i. Source and type
        ii. Type of review

      b. Project Supervision and Mentoring
-      i. Senior project
-     ii. Individual study
-    iii. Research study
-    iv. Honors or Graduate thesis

Service:

1. Teaching
   a. Professional education
   b. Educational research
   c. Non-traditional teaching
   d. Program and accreditation reporting
2. Publications
   a. Journals
   b. Conference Proceedings
   c. Manuals
   d. Codes
   e. Non-traditional media
3. External service recognition, commendations, awards
4. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact.
5. Professional Service
   a. Advisor to student society
   b. Member, Chair, or Officer of professional committees or societies
6. Coordination of teaching or research programs
7. Professional development
8. Chair, member, or officer of Department, College, or University
   a. Committee
   b. Institute
   c. Center
9. Coordinator role: career fair, graduate, TA, undergraduate, and so on
10. Mentoring and Leading: faculty, staff, and students
11. Outreach and Community Activities

5.5 Procedure for Evaluation of Promotion or Progress to Promotion (PtP) for Non Tenure-track Faculty

The purpose of this section of the departmental bylaws is to add the required clarifications to Article 19.8 (b), specifically to 19.8(b)(3) and 19.8(b)(4) of the 2021-24 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), or directly equivalent and substantively unchanged clauses of future collective bargaining agreements.

Pursuant to the timeline and provisions recommended or stipulated in the CBA, at the beginning of the ~~Fall~~ Spring semester following a written application by a Non tenure-track faculty member to be evaluated for promotion or PtP, the department's T&P committee shall review the faculty member's packet. If available, the department Chair shall appoint to the T&P committee a Non-tenure track faculty member senior in rank to the applicant(s). This appointee shall serve as an ad hoc member of the T&P committee solely for the purpose of evaluating those Non-tenure track faculty members who are junior to the

appointee.   The augmented T&P committee shall summarize the case to the eligible department faculty during the evaluation meeting specified by the CBA.

Article 6 Merit Raise Criteria For Non Tenure Track Faculty

6.1 Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

Pay raises based on merit may be used to promote and further various goals of the Dept. of Computer and Information Science and Engineering including:

1. Advance departmental mission
2. Improve the quality of department programs
3. Recognize and reward meritorious performance and sustained excellence of faculty
4. Promote retention of the most valuable and productive faculty
5. Improve faculty morale
6. Provide incentives for future faculty efforts
7. Improve department reputation in national surveys.

6.2 Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises

Merit-based pay raises should be based on the quality and quantity of faculty activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Merit-based raises should generally reflect a continuous trend of productivity and excellence over a period of several years, as opposed to being based on achievements during a single academic year. Merit evaluations should be based on standardized activity reports submitted by the faculty member over the evaluation period, which will serve as the faculty member's 'case for merit'. In addition, merit deliberations may also consider other formal documents prepared during the evaluation period such as: promotion folders including external letters, and recent memoranda of understanding written by the chair following an extended discussion with the faculty member.

The same metrics described in Article 5.4 should be used by the department to determine meritorious performance. The relative importance of the metrics will vary among the ranks. Faculty in the Research scientist track, for example will be evaluated using the Research criteria, while those in the Lecturer track will be judged using the Teaching criteria. Those faculty whose assignments encompass more than one area will be evaluated using the relevant metrics.

6.3 Procedure for Award of Merit Pay Raises

A specific procedure for awarding merit pay raises that is consistent with these general guidelines will be voted on by the non tenure track faculty and maintained on the departmental website. The process may be modified if a proposal to do so is presented to the non tenure track faculty, a discussion and subsequent vote take place, and a majority of the faculty voting vote to form a committee to modify the process. The resulting modification will then presented to, discussed by, and voted on by the tenure track and non tenure track faculty. As an example, the procedure in place at the time this document was produced is:

Procedure for Non-Tenure Track Merit Pay Distribution Process
3/20/07 algorithm

1. A merit pay pool is established by multiplying all non-tenure track salaries by the percentage merit pay allocation.

2. Each NTT faculty member is then placed into one of four "bins," on the basis of a performance rating by the department chair, averaged over the preceding 3 years, using the published criteria for award of merit raises:

    a. bin 1 = needs improvement
    b. bin 2 = satisfactory performance
    c. bin 3 = excellent performance
    d. bin 4 = truly extraordinary performance

    (We would anticipate that "bin 4" would seldom be used, but that it could be used to recognize exceptional achievement

3. A weighting factor (wi) of 1, 2, 3, and 5 is preassigned to bins 1-4 respectively.

4. The calculation of per faculty merit raise for each bin is then calculated using the formula:

$$\text{merit raise} = (\text{total pool \$} * wi) / \sum(wi* \text{number in each bin})$$

Example.   Assume that the NTT merit pool = $2400.
                Assume there are 8 NTT faculty.
                Assume 4 each are assigned to bins 2 and 3.
                Then, merit pay raise for each faculty member in bin 3 would be:

$$\$360 = (\$2400*3)/((4*3)+(4*2)) = \$7200/20$$

This approach will favor those faculty with lower salaries, similar to the tenure-track system that awards fixed dollar amounts.

Article 8 Market Equity Raise Criteria

An individual faculty member may make a request to the department chair to have his/her salary reviewed for consideration of a market equity increase. The chair will assign the review to the appropriate departmental committee. The committee will compare the faculty member's salary with the Oklahoma State University Salary Survey and consider such factors as the faculty member's value and productivity to the department in developing a recommendation. The committee's recommendation will be sent to the chair. The Chair will evaluate the committee's recommendation and make a decision regarding the recommendation.

Article 9 Amendment of the Bylaws

9.1 Voting Faculty

For purposes of adopting or amending this set of bylaws, the Voting Faculty of the Dept. of Computer and Information Science and Engineering shall consist of all tenure track faculty who are employed by the Dept. In addition, faculty in the Engineer, Research Scientist and Lecturer tracks shall have voting privileges on Articles 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 only. Emeritus faculty and faculty holding visiting, adjunct, or courtesy appointments shall not have voting privileges on any of the articles. The Chair or representative shall prepare and maintain a roster of the eligible Voting Faculty and update the list as necessary to reflect additions and deletions as they occur.

9.2 Amendment Process

These bylaws may be amended by the following procedure:
a) The proposed amendment(s) shall be submitted in writing to the faculty at least two (2) weeks before a regular or special Faculty meeting. Bylaws amendments may only be considered at meetings scheduled during the academic year.

b) Upon an affirmative vote by a majority of voting members present at said meeting, the Departmental Representative to the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall conduct, at the earliest opportunity, a mail (or electronic) ballot of the Voting Faculty of the department regarding the proposed amendment(s) to the Bylaws. The faculty in attendance may, by majority vote, revise the proposed amendment(s) prior to proffering them for a ballot.

c) The deadline for return of the ballots shall be no sooner than thirty (30) days from the date of ballot distribution.

d) The Department Chair and the Dept. Representative to the College T&P Committee or their representatives shall count the ballots promptly upon expiration of the return deadline. The amended Bylaws shall take effect one year from the date of certification of approval by a two-thirds majority of the voting faculty.